



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nouncement of the debt, but we replied that we were not going to begin our international career by assuming obligations which we knew we were not in a position to fulfill. There was no possibility of fulfilling such an obligation unless it was made possible for us to bring about a rapid economic revival of Russia. Such a revival depends upon our receiving adequate credits.

CREDITS AND RECOGNITION

This basic point, with its corollary, the *de jure* recognition of Russia, we put forward as conditions for accepting the Allies' compromise. We named one milliard dollars as the credit we required. Then began the wrangle over the question as to which should precede the other—the recognition of debts or the granting of credits. At this period Urquhart came on the scene, even less conciliatory than usual, and his influence over Lloyd-George was obvious. It was finally agreed that Chitcherin should embody the Russian conditions in a letter to Lloyd-George, which should form the basis for further discussions of the Political Subcommission. In this letter the period of the moratorium was to be fixed provisionally at thirty years. This letter was presented, but before the Subcommission could meet our reply to the London memorandum was completed and delivered. This reply was drafted on a different basis from Chitcherin's letter to Lloyd-George, but it represented our position in principle, whereas the letter represented our reply to the definite proposals put before us at the villa. The French delegates at the next meeting of the commission of experts took advantage of the contrast between these two replies, and after a histrionic display they left the committee before an explanation could be offered.

The next step was the Genoa memorandum handed to the Russian delegates on May 2. Political questions of Asia Minor and Rumania that had hitherto not been discussed and were entirely unexpected were introduced into this memorandum. They may have been intended as a basis for retreat, or simply introduced to frighten the Russians, but they did not achieve their object. The assertion that capitalists would not grant credits unless given assurances by the recognition of all old debts was contradicted by the Russo-German Treaty and the various agreements which Russia was concluding with private capitalists. The proposed credit of £20,000,000 was not a credit to Russia, but to foreign capitalists for the purpose of trade, and would be of little use to Russia.

To sum up the results of the conference: In the first place, it was the funeral of the Entente as the rulers of Europe and the personification of the Treaty of Versailles. In the second place, it signified a reorientation of Europe towards Russia, which was markedly evident by the attitude of the various delegates, especially of the neutral and smaller powers, and by the representatives of the powers who displayed great interest—often very sympathetic interest—in Russia.

RUSSIAN COURAGE

The fact that Soviet Russia, with the allied Soviet republics, was the only State that had the courage to resist the hegemony of the Entente during the protracted negotiations at Genoa, and the only State that could attract to its side all the other oppressed States—that, in my opinion, is the victory obtained at Genoa. In no way and under no conditions can that be effaced from the pages of history.

THE CONSEQUENCES

With Russia thus aggressive and "top-lofty," as they say in some parts of this country, notwithstanding her impoverished condition and the resultant calls upon the balance of the world to help feed her famished millions, and with the other nations represented at The Hague having difficulty in agreeing upon a policy with which to confront the Soviet agents, the hesitation, doubts, threats, break-ups and patching-ups that have marked the meetings were well-nigh inevitable. Secretary Hughes' gift of prophecy was hardly overworked when he foresaw these events, at the time he refused the invitation to Genoa, and later when he refused to go to The Hague.

A PRIZE EDITORIAL

FRANK M. O'BRIEN, of the editorial staff of the *New York Herald*, has recently been awarded the Pulitzer prize of \$500 "for the best editorial article written during the year, the test of excellence being clearness of style, moral purpose, sound reasoning, and the power to influence public opinion in the right direction." The editorial, published in the *Herald* November 11, 1921, was as follows:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

That which takes place today at the National Cemetery in Arlington is a symbol, a mystery, and a tribute. It is an entombment only in the physical sense. It is rather the enthronement of Duty and Honor. This man who died for his country is the symbol of these qualities—a far more perfect symbol than any man could be whose name and deeds we knew. He represents more, really, than the unidentified dead, for we cannot separate them spiritually from the war heroes whose names are written on their gravestones. He—this spirit whom we honor—stands for the unselfishness of all.

This, of all monuments to the dead, is lasting and immutable. So long as men revere the finer things of life, the tomb of the nameless hero will remain a shrine. Nor, with the shifts of time and mind, can there be a changing of values. No historian shall rise to modify the virtues or the faults of the Soldier. He has an immunity for which kings might pray. The years may bring erosion to the granite, but not to the memory of the Unknown.

It is a common weakness of humanity to ask the questions that can never be answered in this life. Probably none to whom the drama of the Unknown Soldier has appealed has not wondered who, in the sunshine of earth, was the protagonist of today's ceremony. A logger from the Penobscot? An orchardist from the Pacific coast? A well-driller from Texas? A machinist from Connecticut? A lad who left his hoe to rust among the Missouri corn? A longshoreman from Hell's Kitchen? Perhaps some youth from the tobacco fields, resting again in his own Virginia. All that the army tells us of him is that he died in battle. All that the heart tells is that some woman loved him. More than that, no man shall learn. In this mystery, as in the riddle of the universe, the wise wonder; but they would not know.

What were his dreams, his ambitions? Likely he shared those common to the millions: a life of peace and honest struggle, with such small success as comes to most who try; and at the end the place on the hillside among his fathers. Today to do honor at his last resting-place come the greatest soldiers of the age, famous statesmen from other continents, the President, the high judges and the legislators of his own country, and many men who, like himself, fought for the flag. At his bier will gather the most remarkable group that America has seen. And the tomb which Fate reserved for him is, instead of the narrow cell on the village hillside, one as lasting as that of Rameses and as inspiring as Napoleon's.

It is a great religious ceremony, this burial today.

The exaltation of the nameless bones would not be possible except for Belief. Where were Duty and Honor, the well-springs of Victory, if mankind feared that death drew a black curtain behind which lay nothing but the dark? So all in whom the spark of hope has not died can well believe that we, to whom the Soldier is a mystery, are not a mystery to him. They can believe that the watchers at Arlington today are not merely a few thousands of the living, but the countless battalions of the departed. "Though he were dead, yet shall he live"—there is the promise to which men hold when everything of this earth has slipped away.

All the impressive ritual of today would be a mockery if we did not believe that, out in an infinity which astronomers cannot chart or mathematicians bound, the Unknown Soldier and all the glorious dead whom we honor in his dust are looking down upon this little spinning ball, conscious of our reverence. And when noon strikes, signal for the moment of silent prayer, few of those who stand with bared head will lack conviction that the rites at Arlington are viewed by other than mortal eyes. Only in that spirit may we honor the Unknown Soldier and those who, like him, died for this Republic.

Unknown, but not unknowing!

IRELAND'S BLOODY PATH

In the middle of June, observers of Irish affairs turned from contemplation of the horrors of the strife in Ireland between Irishmen to negotiations in London respecting the Irish constitution. News from London was that the draft of the constitution had been put into shape satisfactory to all parties concerned in the negotiations.

A few days later thought shifted to the election in Ireland, which was proceeding generally in a sane way, despite the excitement and an occasional outbreak. It all was a happy relief from the chain of murders which ordinarily passed before the eyes of spectators of Irish affairs. And to very many there was additional relief and a promise of better things in the evidence that began to appear on June 17 of the victory for the treaty forces—evidence that soon gave way to certainty of an overwhelming victory.

But this picture was not long to hold the gaze. Following the definite news in dispatches on June 20 of the overwhelming victory of the treaty forces, marked as it seemed to be by plain indications that the educated and well-informed of the Irish voters had given their strength almost universally to the treaty advocates, came news on June 21 showing that the results of the balloting made no difference to the extremist Republicans. Led by Eamon de Valera and others who think as he does, the extremists still planned aggressions and talked again of the doctrine that England's difficulty will be Ireland's opportunity.

THE EXTREMISTS' VIEWS

What was in the minds of these men is illustrated by the following excerpt from the Dublin dispatch of June 21 to the *New York Times*:

Speaking in County Kildare, General Liam Mellows said the outlook was black, but that Republicanism was not dead. They would continue the fight until the cause triumphs. He declared the republic continues as long as

the Declaration of Independence exists, and they will defend it with their lives, if that is necessary. Republican leaders present included Generals Rory, O'Connor, and Traynor, Count and Countess Plunket, Harry Boland, Countess Markevitz, Mrs. Clarke, and Miss MacSwiney.

Erskine Childer's paper says:

"The new situation destroys all hope of unifying the army. It seems truly impossible to us that any Republican should co-operate with those who stand for this constitution and mean to impose it on Ireland. It seems impossible that the important body of men, army officers and others, who have turned the scale for treaty solely on the guarantee of their leaders that the constitution would be on Republican lines can stomach this surrender to king and empire."

Eamon de Valera made his expected statement on the constitution this evening. He, in part, said:

"As it stands, it will exclude from public service, and practically disfranchise, every honest Republican. Its test code is as comprehensive against Republicans as the test acts of the Clarendon and Shaftesbury code against Catholic and Dissenters in the reign of Charles II. It is, as Burke described the penal code, a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, a complete system, well defined and well composed in all parts, and peculiarly fitted to the end in view, namely, the degradation of a people, and directed not against the few, but against the many. The Dail Eireann will not dishonor itself by passing it."

Referring to the elections, de Valera said:

"The results indeed seem a triumph for imperial methods of pacification, namely, outrage, murder, and massacre; then a threat, with the concession policy of a kick and a caress, with a kick in reserve. Ireland is not free and will never be at rest or genuinely reconciled with England. England's game is for the moment only. England's difficulty will still be prayed for as Ireland's opportunity."

BLOODSHED AS USUAL

On the next day, June 22, occurred the assassination in London of Field-Marshal Sir Henry Hughes Wilson, who had been Chief of Staff of the British Army in the World War and some time since had become military adviser to the Ulster forces. A bitter opponent of Sinn Fein and a critic of the British Government's Irish policy, his death was immediately ascribed to Irish extremists. No attempt was made to link those who shot him to death in front of his home with the leaders of the extreme Republican forces in Ireland, but the act became a part of the dark picture of Irish hate.

Four days later Winston Churchill and others of the British Government were stating in the House of Commons that existing conditions were a violation of the Irish treaty, and that if the Free State forces were unable to maintain order, the British Government would be at liberty to denounce the treaty and take such steps as might be necessary to the situation, and almost before the words were printed battle started and raged in Dublin between the extremist Republicans and the Free State troops. In another four days affairs in Ireland were in such state that Free State troops were storming the Four Courts, in which Republican insurgents were barricaded, and the cable between Ireland and England had been cut by the rebels.

Finally, the rebel garrison in the Four Courts was compelled to surrender, after considerable loss of life and virtual destruction of the building. But the fighting continued. Grave disturbances occurred in other parts of Ireland, notably in Donegal, and in Dublin itself as late as July 5 there still were rebel troops barricaded in a few buildings and under attack of the Free State forces. But all late signs have pointed to gradual extension of the power of the treaty forces.